

REMARKS

The Examiner states that the claims -- not the specification -- must define the invention. The Examiner further states that limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claim. To be considered, they must be included within the text of the claims. The Applicant agrees wholeheartedly with the Examiner on these points.

However, the Applicant is confused, because on page 7, the Examiner seems to read the limitation to "system" bus into the claims and cites the specification for authority. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that the Applicant has specifically deleted the word "system" from the claims. When the claims, as amended, without the "system" language, are considered, it becomes clear that the Asano reference cannot anticipate such amended claims. Since none of the additional cited references include teachings to the areas of the claimed invention in claims 1 and 11, which are not anticipated by Asano, they cannot provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to these claims. Since the independent claims are not anticipated and are not obvious based upon the cited references, then the dependent claims, which add additional limitations, cannot be found to be obvious based upon the same references.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to fully consider the last amendment, where the word "system" has been deleted. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application as amended.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd A. Hermanson et al

BY: 

Gregory G. Williams, Reg. No. 31,681
SIMMONS, PERRINE, ALBRIGHT & ELLWOOD, P.L.C.
Third Floor Tower Place
22 South Linn Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Telephone: 319-887-1368
Facsimile: 319-887-1372

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, Fax
No. 703-872-9306, on October 13, 2004.


Marian Palmersheim